



Robert W. Quinn, Jr.  
Federal Government Affairs  
Vice President

Suite 1000  
1120 20th Street NW  
Washington DC 20036  
202 457 3851  
FAX 202 457 2545

December 20, 2002

Via Electronic Filing

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Room TWB-204  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Application by Qwest Communications International, Inc. for Authorization to Provide In-Region InterLATA Services in the States of Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, WC Docket No. 02-314

In the Matter of Verizon Petition for Emergency Declaratory and Other Relief, WC Docket No. 02-202

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Thursday December 19, I spoke with Sam Feder, Commissioner Martin's Legal Advisor. We discussed issues raised in the aforementioned proceedings.

On the Qwest application, I reiterated AT&T's opposition on the grounds restated in the ex parte letters filed by AT&T on December 18, 2002 (MLT testing and 272 separate affiliate issues) and December 19, 2002 (secret agreements). On the Security Deposit issue, I reiterated AT&T's belief that the Commission should not issue a policy statement that purports to allow incumbent LECs the ability to bill in advance *all* access customers, regardless of the risks of nonpayment, for any access services, including switched access services - is unlawful, unreasonable, and extremely harmful to the industry and to consumers. Most fundamentally, such an approach is patently overbroad and exceeds what even the ILECs themselves have requested. The advance billing proposal would require even carriers with impeccable payment records to begin paying for access services at least a month earlier. This proposed solution is entirely unresponsive to the alleged problem. According to the ILECs, the problem is *not* that all (or even most) carriers fail to pay for access services in a timely manner. Rather, the ILECs have claimed that they have accumulated growing bad debt expense because a small minority of carriers have been unable to pay for substantial amounts of access services. At most, the appropriate response to such claims is to seek to identify the limited number of carriers that pose the highest risk of non-payment, and to allow the ILECs to obtain reasonable security deposits only from those carriers. The advance billing proposal, however, turns the asserted problem on its head, and demands that *all* carriers suffer the consequences caused by the minority of carriers that are unable to pay for services.

Our comments were consistent with the views expressed in ex partes filed by AT&T as well as the Comments, and Reply Comments previously filed in this proceeding. Consistent with Commission rules, I am filing one electronic copy of this notice and request that you place it in the record of the above-referenced proceedings.

Sincerely,

*Robert H. Quinn Jr.*

cc: Sam Feder